arXiv:1406.5666v3 [math.NA] 30 Jul 2015

STANDARD FINITE ELEMENTS FOR THE NUMERICAL RESOLUTION OF THE ELLIPTIC MONGE-AMPÈRE EQUATION: MIXED METHODS

GERARD AWANOU

Abstract. We prove a convergence result for a mixed finite element method for the Monge-Ampère equation to its weak solution in the sense of Aleksandrov. The unknowns in the formulation are the scalar variable and the Hessian matrix.

1. Introduction

Let Ω be a convex polygonal domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $d = 2, 3$ with boundary $\partial\Omega$. Let $f \in L^\infty(\Omega), g \in C(\partial\Omega)$ with $0 < c_0 \leq f \leq c_1$ for constants $c_0, c_1 > 0$. We assume that g can be extended to a function $\tilde{g} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ which is convex in Ω. We are interested in a mixed finite element method for the nonlinear elliptic Monge-Ampère equation: find a continuous convex function u such that

$$\begin{aligned} \det D^2 u &= f \text{ in } \Omega \\ u &= g \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

The expression $\det D^2 u$ should be interpreted in the sense of Aleksandrov. We review the notion of Aleksandrov solutions in section 3.1. For $u \in C^2(\Omega)$, $\det D^2 u$ is the determinant of the Hessian matrix $D^2 u = \left((\partial^2 u)/(\partial x_i \partial x_j)\right)_{i,j=1,\ldots,d}$.

We consider a mixed formulation with unknowns the scalar variable u and the Hessian $D^2 u$. The scalar variable and the components of the Hessian are approximated by Lagrange elements of degree $k \geq d$. The method considered in this paper was analyzed from different point of views in [27] and [10] for smooth solutions of (1.1) and for $k \geq 3$. The case of quadratic elements in two dimension was handled in [8]. But the convergence of the discretization for non smooth solutions was not understood. We present in this paper a theory which explains these results.

Let $\delta > 0$ be a small parameter and let $\widetilde{\Omega}$ be a convex polygonal subdomain of Ω. Let $f_m, g_m \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $0 < c_2 \leq f_m \leq c_3$, f_m converges uniformly to f on $\overline{\Omega}$ and g_m converges uniformly to $\tilde{g}$ on $\overline{\Omega}$ [9]. It is known, c.f. [5] that the Aleksandrov solution of

$$\det D^2 u_m = f_m \text{ in } \Omega,\ u_m = g_m \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \tag{1.2}$$

converges uniformly on compact subsets of Ω to the Aleksandrov solution u of (1.1). We choose $\tilde{m}$ such that $|f(x) - f_{\tilde{m}}(x)| < \delta$, $|\tilde{g}(x) - g_{\tilde{m}}(x)| < \delta$ and $|u(x) - u_{\tilde{m}}(x)| < \delta$ for all $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}$.

The author was partially supported by NSF DMS grant No 1319640.

Consider the problem: find $\tilde{u} \in C(\overline{\widetilde{\Omega}})$ convex on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ such that

$$\det D^2\tilde{u} = f_{\tilde{m}} \text{ in } \widetilde{\Omega},\ \tilde{u} = u_{\tilde{m}} \text{ on } \overline{\Omega} \setminus \widetilde{\Omega}. \tag{1.3}$$

We prove the uniform convergence on compact subsets of $\widetilde{\Omega}$, for the finite element equations on $\widetilde{\Omega}$, of the discrete scalar variable to the convex Aleksandrov solution of (1.3). By unicity of the Aleksandrov solution u of (1.1), we have $\tilde{u} = u$ in $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and hence as $\widetilde{\Omega} \to \Omega$, $\tilde{u} \to u$ uniformly on compact subsets of Ω. We may thus choose $\widetilde{\Omega}$ close enough to Ω such that g is a good approximation of the Dirichlet data $\tilde{u} = u_{\tilde{m}}$. The boundary data g is used as an approximation of the solution on $\Omega \setminus \widetilde{\Omega}$. The solution u of (1.1) can then be approximated within a prescribed accuracy by first choosing $\tilde{m}$, $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and then h sufficiently small. We emphasize that the solution $\tilde{u}$ of (1.3) is not necessarily smooth.

For the implementation one can simply take $f_{\tilde{m}} = f$ and $\widetilde{\Omega} = \Omega$. It is in that sense that the results of this paper explains the numerical results obtained in [26, 27]. For that reason we do not reproduce them in this paper.

We present the notion of Aleksandrov solution of (1.1) using an analytical definition, following [29]. It is based on approximation by smooth functions. The techniques used in this paper were successfully implemented in the context of standard finite difference discretizations in [3] and in the context of standard finite element methods in [5]. The general methodology consists in

1- Prove the convergence and local uniqueness of the solution of the discrete problem when (1.1) has a smooth solution. Using the continuity of the eigenvalues of a matrix as a function of its entries, prove local uniqueness when the discrete problem has a solution which is piecewise strictly convex.
2- Verify that the numerical method is robust enough to handle the standard tests for non smooth solutions. We emphasize that for non smooth solutions, the implementation of the mixed method should be done as in [27, 26].
3- Consider a sequence of functions $f_m, g_m \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $0 < c_2 \leq f_m \leq c_3$ for constants $c_2, c_3 > 0$, f_m converges uniformly to f on $\overline{\Omega}$ and g_m converges uniformly to $\tilde{g}$ on $\overline{\Omega}$. Consider then the Monge-Ampère equations (with solutions not necessarily smooth)

$$\det D^2 u_m = f_m \text{ in } \Omega, u_m = g_m \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

It is known that, see [5] for details, u_m converges to the Aleksandrov solution u of (1.1) uniformly on compact subsets of Ω.
4- Consider a sequence of smooth uniformly convex domains Ω_s increasing to Ω [11], with the property that $\widetilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega_s$ for all s, and the problems with smooth solutions [32]

$$\det D^2 u_{\tilde{m}s} = f_{\tilde{m}} \text{ in } \Omega_s, u_{\tilde{m}s} = g_{\tilde{m}} \text{ on } \partial\Omega_s.$$

Again one proves that, see [5], $u_{\tilde{m}s}$ converges uniformly on compact subsets of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ to $\tilde{u}$ as $s \to \infty$.
5- Establish that the discrete approximation $u_{ms,h}$ of the smooth function u_{ms}, on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and with boundary data u_{ms}, converges uniformly to u_{ms} on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ as $h \to 0$.

This usually takes the form of an error estimate with constants depending on derivatives of u_{ms}.

6- Because $\widetilde{\Omega}$ is an interior domain, interior Schauder estimates allow to get a uniform bound on the derivatives of $u_{\tilde{m}s}$. In other words, $u_{\tilde{m}s,h}$ converges uniformly to $u_{\tilde{m}s}$ on compact subsets of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ at a rate which depends on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ but is independent of s.

7- The local equicontinuity of piecewise convex functions allow to take a subsequence in s. This gives a piecewise convex finite element function u_h which solves the finite element problem on $\widetilde{\Omega}$. The approximation u_h is shown to converge uniformly on compact subsets of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ to the solution of (1.3). Local uniqueness of the solution is a consequence of the work done in step 1. See also Remark 3.10.

Given the above program, the main technical difficulties consist in completing steps 1 and 7. For steps 1 and 2, in this paper, we build on the work done in [27, 26, 10, 8]. For each type of discretization we have considered, step 7 requires new ideas.

Given the definition of Aleksandrov solution, it is natural to expect a discrete version of the comparison principle for a discretization. The lack of such a comparison principle is related to the difficulty of proving stability of the discretization for smooth solutions without assuming a bound on a high order norm of the solution. For that reason, we introduced the theoretical computational domain $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and fix the parameter $\tilde{m}$ in the regularization of the data.

Our focus on standard discretizations is motivated by the need to allow the efficient tools developed for computational mathematics such as adaptive mesh refinements and multigrid methods to be transferred seamlessly to the context of the Monge-Ampère equation. We expect that the general strategy of this paper can be adapted to the various mixed methods proposed in [18, 20, 27]. The main difficulty is an error analysis for smooth solutions of (1.1) with piecewise linear finite element approximations. We consider these and some lower order elements in [2]. See Remark 3.3.

Monge-Ampère equations arise in several applications of increasing importance, e.g. optimal transportation and reflector design. In fact, in optimal transportation problems, the approach through Aleksandrov solutions is more natural as it allows to treat discontinuous right hand sides.

In [18, 23, 20, 26], it was suggested that the issue could be approached through the notion of viscosity solution of (1.1). Both notions of viscosity and Aleksandrov solutions for (1.1) coincide for $f > 0$ and continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$ [24]. The investigation of numerical methods for (1.1) through the notion of viscosity solutions is still an active research area. A proven convergence method for (1.1) through the notion of viscosity solution was obtained through monotone finite difference schemes, see for example [21]. For an approach through the notion of Aleksandrov solution for the two dimensional problem, we refer to [28]. The geometric approach taken in [28] is different from the approach taken in this paper. Other finite element discretizations have been proposed, e.g. [12, 17, 15].

We organize the paper as follows. In the second section we introduce some notation and preliminaries. In the last section we prove our convergence result for non smooth solutions.

2. Notation and Preliminaries

Let O be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d, d = 2, 3$. We use the usual notation $L^p(O), 2 \leq p \leq \infty$ for the Lebesgue spaces and $H^s(O), 1 \leq s < \infty$ for the Sobolev spaces of elements of $L^2(O)$ with weak derivatives of order less than or equal to s in $L^2(O)$. We recall that $H^1_0(O)$ is the subset of $H^1(O)$ of elements with vanishing trace on ∂O. We also recall that $W^{s,\infty}(O)$ is the Sobolev space of functions with weak derivatives of order less than or equal to s in $L^\infty(O)$. For a given normed space X, we denote by X^d the space of vector fields with components in X and by $X^{d\times d}$ the space of matrix fields with each component in X.

The norm in X is denoted by $||.||_X$ and we omit the subscript O and superscripts d and $d \times d$ when it is clear from the context. The inner product in $L^2(O), L^2(O)^d$, and $L^2(O)^{d\times d}$ is denoted by $(,)$ and we use $\langle , \rangle$ for the inner product on $L^2(\partial O)$ and $L^2(\partial O)^d$. For inner products on subsets of O, we will simply append the subset notation. We recall that for a matrix A, A_{ij} denote its entries and the cofactor matrix of A, denoted $\operatorname{cof} A$, is the matrix with entries $(\operatorname{cof} A)_{ij} = (-1)^{i+j} \det(A)^j_i$ where $\det(A)^j_i$ is the determinant of the matrix obtained from A by deleting its ith row and its jth column. For two matrices $A = (A_{ij})$ and $B = (B_{ij})$, $A : B = \sum_{i,j=1}^n A_{ij}B_{ij}$ denotes their Frobenius inner product. A quantity which is constant is simply denoted by C.

For a scalar function v, we denote by Dv its gradient vector and recall that D^2v denotes the Hessian matrix of second order derivatives. The divergence of a matrix field is understood as the vector obtained by taking the divergence of each row.

2.1. Discrete variational problem.

We denote by $\mathcal{T}_h$ a triangulation of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ into simplices K and assume that $\mathcal{T}_h$ is quasi-uniform. Let n denote the unit outward normal vector of $\partial\widetilde{\Omega}$. We will need the broken Sobolev norm

$$||v||_{H^k(\mathcal{T}_h)} = \left(\sum_{K\cap\widetilde{\Omega}, K\in\mathcal{T}_h} ||v||^2_{H^k(K)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Analogously, we define $||v||_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathcal{T}_h)} = \max_{K\cap\widetilde{\Omega}, K\in\mathcal{T}_h} ||v||_{W^{1,\infty}(K)}$. We denote by $V_h(\widetilde{\Omega})$ the standard Lagrange finite element space of degree $k \geq d$ and denote by $\Sigma_h(\widetilde{\Omega})$ the space of symmetric matrix fields with components in the Lagrange finite element space of degree $k \geq d$. We make the abuse of notation of denoting by V_h and Σ_h respectively the spaces $V_h(\widetilde{\Omega})$ and $\Sigma_h(\widetilde{\Omega})$. Similarly $(,)$ and $\langle , \rangle$ will be used to denote inner products for functions defined on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and $\partial\widetilde{\Omega}$ respectively.

Let I_h denote the standard Lagrange interpolation operator from $C(\widetilde{\Omega})$, the space of continuous functions on $\widetilde{\Omega}$, into the space V_h. We use as well the notation I_h for the matrix version of the Lagrange interpolation operator mapping $C(\widetilde{\Omega})^{d\times d}$ into Σ_h.

We consider the problem: find $(u_h, \sigma_h) \in V_h \times \Sigma_h$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma_h, \tau) + (\operatorname{div} \tau, Du_h) - \langle Du_h, \tau n\rangle &= 0, \forall \tau \in \Sigma_h \\ (\det \sigma_h, v) &= (f_{\tilde{m}}, v),\ \forall v \in V_h \cap H_0^1(\widetilde{\Omega}) \\ u_h &= u_{\tilde{m}} \text{ on } \partial\widetilde{\Omega}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

By $u_h = u_{\tilde{m}}$ on $\partial\widetilde{\Omega}$, we mean that our approximations are discontinuous on the boundary and that u_h coincides with $u_{\tilde{m}}$ at the Lagrange points on $\partial\widetilde{\Omega}$. From a practical point of view, since $\widetilde{\Omega}$ is assumed sufficiently close to Ω, one considers the analogue of Problem (2.1) on Ω with $u_h = g$ on $\partial\Omega$ and f at the place of $f_{\tilde{m}}$.

2.2. **Properties of the Lagrange finite element spaces.** We recall some properties of the Lagrange finite element space of degree $k \geq 1$ that will be used in this paper. They can be found in [14]. We have

Interpolation error estimates.

$$||v - I_h v||_{L^\infty} \leq C h^{k+1-\frac{d}{2}} |v|_{H^{k+1}}, \forall v \in H^{k+1}(\Omega). \tag{2.2}$$

Inverse inequalities

$$||v||_{L^\infty} \leq C h^{-\frac{d}{2}} ||v||_{L^2}, \forall v \in V_h \tag{2.3}$$

$$||v||_{H^1} \leq C h^{-1} ||v||_{L^2}, \forall v \in V_h \tag{2.4}$$

$$||v||_{W^{1,\infty}(\mathcal{T}_h)} \leq C h^{-\frac{d}{2}} ||v||_{H^1}, \forall v \in V_h. \tag{2.5}$$

Scaled trace inequality

$$||v||_{L^2(\partial\widetilde{\Omega})} \leq C h^{-\frac{1}{2}} ||v||_{L^2(\widetilde{\Omega})},\ \forall v \in V_h(\widetilde{\Omega}). \tag{2.6}$$

2.3. **Error analysis of the mixed method for smooth solutions.** Let us assume that the unique convex solution u of of (1.1) is in $H^3(\Omega)$ and put $\sigma = D^2 u$. Then u satisfies the following mixed problem: find $(u, \sigma) \in H^2(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega)^{d\times d}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma, \tau) + (\operatorname{div} \tau, Du) - \langle Du, \tau n\rangle &= 0, \forall \tau \in H^1(\Omega)^{d\times d} \\ (\det \sigma, v) &= (f, v), \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega) \\ u &= g \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

It is proved in [10] that the above variational problem is well defined. We will assume without loss of generality that $h \leq 1$. We define for $\rho > 0$,

$$\bar{B}_h(\rho) = \{(w_h, \eta_h) \in V_h \times \Sigma_h,\ \|w_h - I_h u\|_{H^1} \leq \rho,\ \|\eta_h - I_h \sigma\|_{L^2} \leq h^{-1}\rho\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_h = \{\, &(w_h, \eta_h) \in V_h \times \Sigma_h, w_h = u \text{ on } \partial\widetilde{\Omega}, \\ &(\eta_h, \tau) + (\operatorname{div} \tau, Dw_h) - \langle Dw_h, \tau \cdot n\rangle = 0, \forall \tau \in \Sigma_h \,\} \text{ and} \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

$$B_h(\rho) = \bar{B}_h(\rho) \cap Z_h. \tag{2.9}$$

We recall that, [10, Lemma 3.5], the ball $B_h(\rho) \neq \emptyset$ for $\rho = C_0 h^k$ for a constant $C_0 > 0$.

It follows from the analysis in [27, 10, 8] that (2.1) is well-posed for $k \geq d$ and for $(u, \sigma) \in H^{k+3}(\Omega) \times H^{k+1}(\Omega)^{d\times d}$ we have the error estimates

$$||u - u_h||_{H^1(\widetilde{\Omega})} \leq Ch^k \tag{2.10}$$

$$||\sigma - \sigma_h||_{L^2(\widetilde{\Omega})} \leq Ch^{k-1}. \tag{2.11}$$

The constant C can be taken to be a constant multiple of $||u||_{H^{k+3}(\Omega)}$.

2.4. **Algebra with matrix fields.** We collect in the following lemma some properties of matrix fields, the proof of which can be found in [10, 4].

Lemma 2.1. *We have for two matrix fields η and τ*

$$\det \eta - \det \tau = \operatorname{cof}(r\eta + (1-r)\tau) : (\eta - \tau), \tag{2.12}$$

for some $r \in [0, 1]$.

For $d = 2$ and $d = 3$, and two matrix fields η and τ

$$||\operatorname{cof}(\eta) : \tau||_{L^2} \leq C||\eta||^{d-1}_{L^\infty}||\tau||_{L^2}. \tag{2.13}$$

2.5. **Continuity of the eigenvalues of a matrix as a function of its entries.** Let $\lambda_1(A)$ and $\lambda_2(A)$ denote the smallest and largest eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix A. We have

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that $u \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$. Then there exists constants $r, R > 0$ independent of h and a constant $C_{conv} > 0$ independent of h such that for all $v_h \in V_h$ with $v_h = u$ on $\partial\widetilde{\Omega}$ and*

$$||v_h - I_h u||_{H^1} < C_{conv}h^2,$$

we have

$$r \leq \lambda_1(D^2 v_h(x)) \leq \lambda_2(v_h(x)) \leq M, \forall x \in K \cap \widetilde{\Omega}.$$

Proof. The result is a consequence of the assumptions $0 < c_0 \leq f \leq c_1$ and the continuity of the eigenvalues of a matrix as a function of its entries. See for example [7, Lemma 3.1]. □

3. Convergence of the discretization to the Aleksandrov solution

3.1. **The Aleksandrov solution.** We denote by $K(\Omega)$ the cone of convex functions on Ω and by $B(\Omega)$ the space of Borel measures on Ω. Let M denote the mapping

$$M : C^2(\Omega) \cap K(\Omega) \to B(\Omega)$$

$$M[v](B) = \int_B \det D^2 v(x)\, dx, \text{ for a Borel set } B.$$

We equip $K(\Omega)$ with the topology of compact convergence, i.e. for $v_m, v \in K(\Omega)$, v_m converges to v if and only if v_m converges to v uniformly on compact subsets of Ω. We endow $B(\Omega)$ with the topology of weak convergence of measures.

Definition 3.1. *A sequence μ_m of Borel measures converges weakly to a Borel measure μ if and only if*

$$\int_\Omega p(x)\, d\mu_m \to \int_\Omega p(x)\, d\mu,$$

for every continuous function p with compact support in Ω.

If the measures μ_m have density a_m with respect to the Lebesgue measure, and μ has density a with respect to the Lebesgue measure, we have

Definition 3.2. *Let $a_m, a \geq 0$ be given functions. The sequence a_m converges weakly to a as measures if and only if*

$$\int_\Omega a_m p\, dx \to \int_\Omega ap\, dx,$$

for all continuous functions p with compact support in Ω.

It can be shown that the mapping M extends uniquely to a continuous operator on $K(\Omega)$, c.f. [29, Proposition 3.1]. Thus we have

Lemma 3.3. *Let v_m be a sequence of convex functions in Ω such that $v_m \to v$ uniformly on compact subsets of Ω. Then the associated Monge-Ampère measures $M[v_m]$ tend to $M[v]$ weakly.*

We can now define the notion of Aleksandrov solution of (1.1).

Definition 3.4. *A convex function $u \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ is an Aleksandrov solution of* (1.1) *if only if $u = g$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $M[u]$ has density f with respect to the Lebesgue measure.*

It is shown in [29, Proposition 3.4] that the extension of the mapping M to $K(\Omega)$ coincides with the definition of Monge-Ampère measure as curvature measure.

Theorem 3.5 (Theorem 1.1 [25])**.** *Let Ω be a bounded convex domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and assume that g can be extended to a function $\tilde{g} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ which is convex in Ω. Then if $f \in L^1(\Omega)$,* (1.1) *has a unique convex Aleksandrov solution in $C(\overline{\Omega})$ which assumes the boundary condition in the classical sense.*

3.2. **Properties of convex functions.** We will use the following lemma

Lemma 3.6. *A uniformly bounded sequence u_j of convex functions on a convex domain Ω is locally uniformly equicontinuous and thus has a pointwise convergent subsequence.*

Proof. For $p_j \in \partial u_j(x)$ and $x \in \Omega$, we have by [24, Lemma 3.2.1]

$$|p_j| \leq \frac{|u_j(x)|}{d(x, \partial\Omega)} \leq \frac{C}{d(x, \partial\Omega)},$$

for a constant C independent of j. Arguing as in the proof of [24, Lemma 1.1.6], it follows that the sequence u_j is uniformly Lipschitz and hence equicontinuous on compact subsets of Ω. By the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, [31, p. 179], we conclude that the result holds.

□

We also note

Lemma 3.7 ([30] Theorem 25.7)**.** *Let v be a convex function which is finite and differentiable on Ω. Let v_m be a sequence of convex functions finite and differentiable on Ω such that v_m converges pointwise to v on Ω. Then*

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} Dv_m(x) = Dv(x), \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Moreover, the mappings Dv_m converge to Dv uniformly on every closed bounded subset of Ω.

Remark 3.8. *For a sequence of convex polynomials on a convex open set C, the above theorem holds for every compact subset of $\overline{C}$. The proofs are identical.*

3.3. **Smooth and polygonal exhaustions of the domain.** Let Ω_s denote a sequence of smooth uniformly convex domains increasing to Ω, i.e. $\Omega_s \subset \Omega_{s+1} \subset \Omega$ and $d(\partial\Omega_s, \partial\Omega) \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$. Here $d(\partial\Omega_s, \partial\Omega)$ denotes the distance between $\partial\Omega_s$ and $\partial\Omega$. The existence of the sequence Ω_s follows for example from the approach in [11]. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\widetilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega_s$ for all s.

We recall that f_m and g_m are $C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ functions such that $0 < c_2 \leq f_m \leq c_3, f_m \to f$ and $g_m \to \tilde{g}$ uniformly on $\overline{\Omega}$. It follows from [16] that the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \det D^2 u_{ms} &= f_m \text{ in } \Omega_s \\ u_{ms} &= g_m \text{ on } \partial\Omega_s, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

has a unique convex solution $u_{ms} \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega}_s)$. It is known, see [5] for details, that the sequence u_{ms} converges uniformly on compact subsets of Ω to the unique convex solution $u_m \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ of the problem (2.7).

Put $\sigma_{ms} = D^2 u_{ms}$. We consider the subdomain problem, analogue of (2.7): find $(u_{\tilde{m}s}, \sigma_{\tilde{m}s}) \in H^2(\widetilde{\Omega}) \times H^1(\widetilde{\Omega})^{d\times d}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma_{\tilde{m}s}, \tau) + (\operatorname{div}\tau, Du_{\tilde{m}s}) - \langle Du_{\tilde{m}s}, \tau n\rangle &= 0, \forall \tau \in H^1(\widetilde{\Omega})^{d\times d} \\ (\det \sigma_{\tilde{m}s}, v) &= (f_{\tilde{m}}, v), \forall v \in H_0^1(\widetilde{\Omega}) \\ u_{\tilde{m}s} &= g_{\tilde{m}} \text{ on } \partial\widetilde{\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

We now consider the analogue of (2.1): find $(u_{\tilde{m}s,h}, \sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}) \in V_h \times \Sigma_h$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}, \tau) + (\operatorname{div}\tau, Du_{\tilde{m}s,h}) - \langle Du_{\tilde{m}s,h}, \tau n\rangle &= 0, \forall \tau \in \Sigma_h \\ (\det \sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}, v) &= (f_{\tilde{m}}, v),\ \forall v \in V_h \cap H_0^1(\widetilde{\Omega}) \\ u_{\tilde{m}s,h} &= u_{\tilde{m}} \text{ on } \partial\widetilde{\Omega}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

It follows from the results of section 2.3 and the discussion above, that (3.2) has a solution which satisfies for h sufficiently small

$$||u_{\tilde{m}s} - u_{\tilde{m}s,h}||_{H^1} \leq C_{\tilde{m}s} h^k \tag{3.3}$$

$$||\sigma_{\tilde{m}s} - \sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}||_{L^2} \leq C_{\tilde{m}s} h^{k-1}, \tag{3.4}$$

for a constant $C_{\tilde{m}s}$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.2, $u_{\tilde{m}s,h}$ is piecewise strictly convex.

3.4. **Convergence of the discretization.** We can now state our main theorem

Theorem 3.9. *Under the assumptions set forth in the introduction, Problem* (2.1) *has a local solution* (u_h, σ_h) *for* h *sufficiently small, with* u_h *a piecewise convex function. Moreover* u_h *converges uniformly on compact subsets of* $\widetilde{\Omega}$ *to the unique* $C(\widetilde{\Omega})$ *solution of* (1.3) *which is convex on* $\widetilde{\Omega}$.

Proof. It remains to complete steps 6 and 7 of the program outlined in the introduction.

Part 1: The existence of a limit u_h.

By (3.3) and the inverse estimate (2.5), we have on $\widetilde{\Omega}$

$$||u_{ms} - u_{ms,h}||_{W^{1,\infty}} \leq C_{ms} h^{-\frac{d}{2}} ||u_{ms} - u_{ms,h}||_{H^1} \leq C_{ms} h^{k-\frac{d}{2}},$$

where C_{ms} depends on $||u_{ms}||_{C^{k+1}(\widetilde{\Omega})}$.

On each compact subset K of Ω, we have by the interior Schauder estimates, [19, Theorem 4] and [6] for details,

$$||u_{\tilde{m}s}||_{C^2(K)} \leq C_{\tilde{m}}, \tag{3.5}$$

where the constant $C_{\tilde{m}}$ depends on $\tilde{m}, c_2$, $\widetilde{\Omega}$, $d(K, \partial\Omega)$, $f_{\tilde{m}}$ and $\max_{x\in\Omega} |u_{\tilde{m}s}(x)|$. Moreover, by a bootstrapping argument we have

$$||u_{\tilde{m}s}||_{C^{k+3}(K)} \leq ||u_{\tilde{m}s}||_{C^{k+3}(\widetilde{\Omega})} \leq C_{\tilde{m}}, \tag{3.6}$$

as well.

We conclude that the sequence in s of piecewise convex functions $u_{\tilde{m}s,h}$ is uniformly bounded on compact subsets of $\widetilde{\Omega}$, and hence by Lemma 3.6 has a convergent subsequence also denoted by $u_{\tilde{m}s,h}$ which converges pointwise to a function u_h. The function u_h is piecewise convex as the pointwise limit of piecewise convex functions and the convergence is uniform on compact subsets of $\widetilde{\Omega}$.

Next, we note that for a fixed h, $u_{\tilde{m}s,h}$ is a piecewise polynomial in the variable x of fixed degree k and convergence of polynomials is equivalent to convergence of their coefficients. Thus u_h is a piecewise polynomial of degree k. Moreover, the continuity conditions on $u_{\tilde{m}s,h}$ are linear equations involving its coefficients. Thus u_h has the same continuity property as $u_{\tilde{m}s,h}$. In other words $u_h \in V_h$.

Part 2: The existence of a limit function σ_h and equations solved by the pair (u_h, σ_h).

We have for $\tau \in \Sigma_h$

$$\begin{aligned} -(\operatorname{div}\tau, Du_{\tilde{m}s,h}) + \langle Du_{\tilde{m}s,h}, \tau n\rangle = &- \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \int_{K\cap\widetilde{\Omega}} (Du_{\tilde{m}h,s}) \cdot \operatorname{div}\tau \, dx \\ &+ \int_{K\cap\partial\widetilde{\Omega}} (Du_{\tilde{m}h,s}) \cdot (\tau n) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $u_{\tilde{m}s,h}$ is convex on $K \cap \widetilde{\Omega}$ and converges uniformly on compact subsets of $K \cap \widetilde{\Omega}$ to u_h. In this part of the proof, we consider the continuous extension of $u_{\tilde{m}s,h}$ and u_h up to the boundary $\partial\widetilde{\Omega}$. We then obtain from Remark 3.8

$$\int_{K\cap\widetilde{\Omega}}(Du_{\tilde{m}h,s})\cdot \operatorname{div}\tau\, dx \to \int_{K\cap\widetilde{\Omega}}(Du_h)\cdot \operatorname{div}\tau\, dx$$

and

$$\int_{K\cap\partial\widetilde{\Omega}}(Du_{\tilde{m}h,s})\cdot(\tau n_s)\, dx \to \int_{K\cap\partial\widetilde{\Omega}}(Du_h)\cdot(\tau n)\, dx.$$

We conclude that as $s\to\infty$

$$-(\operatorname{div}\tau, Du_{\tilde{m}s,h}) + \langle Du_{\tilde{m}s,h}, \tau n\rangle \to F_h(\tau) := (\operatorname{div}\tau, Du_h) - \langle Du_h, \tau n\rangle. \tag{3.7}$$

For h fixed, we have by (2.4) and (2.6)

$$\begin{aligned}|F_h(\tau)| &\leq C(||\tau||_{H^1}||Du_h||_{L^2} + ||\tau||_{L^2(\partial\widetilde{\Omega})}||Du_h||_{L^2(\partial\widetilde{\Omega})})\\ &\leq C(h^{-1}||Du_h||_{L^2} + h^{-\frac{1}{2}}||Du_h||_{L^2(\partial\widetilde{\Omega})})||\tau||_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus F_h is continuous on Σ_h and by the Riesz representation theorem, there exists a unique $\sigma_h\in\Sigma_h$ such that

$$F_h(\tau) = (\sigma_h, \tau).$$

In other words $(u_h,\sigma_h)\in V_h\times\Sigma_h$ solves

$$(\sigma_h,\tau) + (\operatorname{div}\tau, Du_h) - \langle Du_h, \tau n\rangle = 0, \forall\tau\in\Sigma_h. \tag{3.8}$$

The result can also be stated as follows:

$$(\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h},\tau)\to(\sigma_h,\tau) \text{ as } s\to\infty \text{ and } \forall\tau\in\Sigma_h. \tag{3.9}$$

It remains to show that

$$(\det\sigma_h, v) = (f, v), \forall v\in V_h\cap H_0^1(\widetilde{\Omega}). \tag{3.10}$$

By the error estimate for smooth solutions (3.4) and the interior Schauder estimate (3.6), we have

$$||\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}||_{L^2}\leq C,$$

for a constant C which depends on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and $\tilde{m}$ but is independent of s. By assumption $\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}\in H^1(\widetilde{\Omega})$ and by (2.4)

$$||\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}||_{H^1}\leq Ch^{-1}||\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}||_{L^2}\leq Ch^{-1}.$$

Since $d=2,3$, by the compactness of the embedding of $H^1(\widetilde{\Omega})$ into $L^4(\widetilde{\Omega})$, up to a subsequence $\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}$ converges to a function $\hat{\sigma}_h$ in $L^4(\widetilde{\Omega})$. We thus have

$$(\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h},\tau)\to(\hat{\sigma}_h,\tau) \text{ as } s\to\infty \text{ and } \forall\tau\in\Sigma_h. \tag{3.11}$$

By (3.9) and (3.11) we have

$$(\hat{\sigma}_h,\tau) = (\sigma_h,\tau)\ \forall\tau\in\Sigma_h, \text{ i.e. } \sigma_h = P_{\Sigma_h}(\hat{\sigma}_h), \tag{3.12}$$

where we denote by P_{Σ_h} the L^2 projection into Σ_h.

We have by (2.12) and (3.12) for some $r \in [0,1]$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\widetilde{\Omega}}(\det\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}-\det\sigma_h)v\,dx &= \int_{\widetilde{\Omega}}\operatorname{cof}(r\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}+(1-r)\sigma_h):(\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}-\sigma_h)v\,dx\\ &= \int_{\widetilde{\Omega}}P_{\Sigma_h}\big(v\operatorname{cof}(r\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}+(1-r)\sigma_h)\big):(\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}-\sigma_h)\,dx\\ &= \int_{\widetilde{\Omega}}P_{\Sigma_h}\big(v\operatorname{cof}(r\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}+(1-r)\sigma_h)\big):(\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}-\hat{\sigma}_h)\,dx\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{\widetilde{\Omega}}(\det\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}-\det\sigma_h)v\,dx\right| &\le C||v||_{L^\infty}||\operatorname{cof}(r\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}+(1-r)\sigma_h)||_{L^\infty}||\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}-\hat{\sigma}_h||_{L^1}\\ &\le C||v||_{L^\infty}(||\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}||_{L^\infty}+||\sigma_h||_{L^\infty})^{d-1}||\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}-\hat{\sigma}_h||_{L^1}\\ &\le C||v||_{L^\infty}(h^{-\frac{d}{2}}||\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}||_{L^2}+h^{-\frac{d}{2}}||\sigma_h||_{L^2})^{d-1}||\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}-\hat{\sigma}_h||_{L^4}\\ &\le C||v||_{L^\infty}(Ch^{-\frac{d}{2}}+h^{-\frac{d}{2}}||\sigma_h||_{L^2})^{d-1}||\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h}-\hat{\sigma}_h||_{L^4}\\ &\to 0 \text{ as } s\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $(\det\sigma_{\tilde{m}s,h},v)=(f_{\tilde{m}},v)$. It follows that (3.10) holds, i.e. since $u_h=u_{\tilde{m}}$ on $\partial\widetilde{\Omega}$, the pair (u_h,σ_h) solves (2.1).

Part 3: Uniform convergence on compact subsets of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ of u_h to $\tilde{u}$.

Since $u_{\tilde{m}s,h}$ is uniformly bounded on compact subsets of $\widetilde{\Omega}$, so is u_h. It follows from Lemma 3.6 that there exists a subsequence u_{h_l} which converges pointwise to a piecewise convex function v. The latter is continuous on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ as it is locally finite. Moreover the convergence is uniform on compact subsets of $\widetilde{\Omega}$.

Let K be a compact subset of $\widetilde{\Omega}$. There exists a subsequence $u_{\tilde{m},s_l,h}$ which converges uniformly to u_h on K. By the uniform convergence of u_{ms} to u_m, $u_{\tilde{m},s_l}$ converges uniformly to $\tilde{u}$ on K.

Let now $\epsilon>0$. Since u_{h_l} converges uniformly on K to v, $\exists l_0$ such that $\forall l\ge l_0$ $|u_{h_l}(x)-v(x)|<\epsilon/6$ for all $x\in K$.

There exists $l_1\ge 0$ such that for all $l\ge\max\{\,l_0,l_1\,\}$, $|u_{\tilde{m}s_l,h_l}(x)-u_{h_l}(x)|<\epsilon/6$ for all $x\in K$.

Moreover, there exists $l_2\ge 0$ such that for all $l\ge\max\{\,l_0,l_1,l_2\,\}$, $|u_{\tilde{m}s_l}(x)-\tilde{u}(x)|<\epsilon/6$ for all $x\in K$.

By (3.3) we have on K $|u_{\tilde{m}s,h_l}(x)-u_{\tilde{m}s}(x)|\le Ch_l$ for all $x\in K$. We recall that the constant C is independent of s but depends on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and $\tilde{m}$.

We conclude that for $l\ge\max\{\,l_0,l_1,l_2\,\}$, $|\tilde{u}(x)-v(x)|<\epsilon/2+Ch_l$ for all $x\in K$. We therefore have for all $\epsilon>0$ $|\tilde{u}(x)-v(x)|<\epsilon$. We conclude that $\tilde{u}=v$ on K.

Since $u_h=u_{\tilde{m}}$ on $\partial\widetilde{\Omega}$ it follows that $v=\tilde{u}$ on $\partial\widetilde{\Omega}$. This proves that $\tilde{u}=v$ on $\widetilde{\Omega}$.

We conclude that u_h converges uniformly on compact subsets of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ to $\tilde{u}$.

The proof is complete.

□

Remark 3.10. *Let $x_0 \in \Omega$. We may assume that the solution u_h is strictly convex by identifying u_h with $u_h + \epsilon|x - x_0|^2$, where $|.|$ denotes the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and ϵ is taken to be close to machine precision. The arguments in* [10] *can then be repeated to show that the solution of* (2.1) *given in the previous theorem is locally unique. Using the notation of* [8] *for the 2D problem, one only needs to take the rescaling parameter α equal to νh^{k+2}.*

Remark 3.11. *For $k \geq d+1$, a different proof of local uniqueness can be given based on the fixed point argument of* [8] *. Arguing as in* [5, section 7.1]*, one shows that $\det \sigma_h > 0$. We can then define a discrete strictly convex function as determined by a pair (u_h, σ_h) for which σ_h is a positive definite matrix. However, in* [8]*, to handle the quadratic case, we essentially used the positive definiteness of $D^2 u_h$ computed piecewise. Similar arguments can be given by using instead the positive definiteness of σ_h. Given the length of this paper, we wish to address this approach in a separate work.*

Remark 3.12. *The only reason we assume that $k \geq 3$ in three dimension is that the numerical solution in the case $k = 2$ is much closer to the Lagrange interpolant than what can be observed numerically using the approximation property of the Lagrange finite element spaces. The solution is to use a rescaled version of the equation, i.e. $\det D^2 \beta u = \beta^d f$, for a suitable $\beta > 0$. The same argument applies to the analysis in* [7].

Remark 3.13. *One of the main tools used in* [3] *and* [5] *is the weak convergence of Monge-Ampère measures, c.f. Lemma 3.3. It requires the approximation of the scalar variable to be at least piecewise quadratic. In this paper, we were able to take advantage of the mixed formulation to prove weak convergence.*

Remark 3.14. *If one assumes that the domain Ω is smooth and uniformly convex, one can take $\widetilde{\Omega} = \Omega$ and use global Schauder estimates, c.f.* [5] *for details. For the implementation, one should use Nitsche method to enforce the boundary condition and curvilinear coordinates for elements near the boundary. We refer to* [13] *for this approach in the context of smooth solutions. One can also use isogeometric analysis as in* [1].

References

[1] Awanou, G.: Isogeometric method for the elliptic Monge-Ampère equation. In: Approximation Theory, XIV (San Antonio, TX, 2013), pp. 1–13 (2014)

[2] Awanou, G.: Low order mixed finite element approximations of the Monge-Ampère equation (2014). Manuscript

[3] Awanou, G.: On standard finite difference discretizations of the elliptic Monge-Ampère equation (2014). http://arxiv.org/pdf/1311.2812v5.pdf

[4] Awanou, G.: Pseudo transient continuation and time marching methods for Monge-Ampère type equations. Advances in Computational Mathematics pp. 1–29 (2014). DOI 10.1007/s10444-014-9391-y. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10444-014-9391-y`

[5] Awanou, G.: Standard finite elements for the numerical resolution of the elliptic Monge-Ampère equation: Aleksandrov solutions (2014). http://arxiv.org/pdf/1310.4568v4.pdf

[6] Awanou, G.: Standard finite elements for the numerical resolution of the elliptic Monge-Ampère equation: Aleksandrov solutions (2014). http://homepages.math.uic.edu/~awanou/up.html

[7] Awanou, G.: Standard finite elements for the numerical resolution of the elliptic Monge-Ampère equation: classical solutions. IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis (2014). DOI 10.1093/imanum/dru028. URL `http://imajna.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2014/05/30/imanum.dru028.abstract`

[8] Awanou, G.: Quadratic mixed finite element approximations of the Monge-Ampère equation in 2 D (2015). To appear in Calcolo

[9] Awanou, G.: Smooth approximations of the Aleksandrov solution of the Monge-Ampère equation. Commun. Math. Sci. **13**(2), 427–441 (2015)

[10] Awanou, G., Li, H.: Error analysis of a mixed finite element method for the Monge-Ampère equation. Int. J. Num. Analysis and Modeling **11**, 745–761 (2014)

[11] Błocki, Z.: Smooth exhaustion functions in convex domains. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **125**(2), 477–484 (1997)

[12] Böhmer, K.: On finite element methods for fully nonlinear elliptic equations of second order. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **46**(3), 1212–1249 (2008)

[13] Brenner, S.C., Gudi, T., Neilan, M., Sung, L.Y.: C^0 penalty methods for the fully nonlinear Monge-Ampère equation. Math. Comp. **80**(276), 1979–1995 (2011)

[14] Brenner, S.C., Scott, L.R.: The mathematical theory of finite element methods, *Texts in Applied Mathematics*, vol. 15, second edn. Springer-Verlag, New York (2002)

[15] Caboussat, A., Glowinski, R., Sorensen, D.C.: A least-squares method for the numerical solution of the Dirichlet problem for the elliptic Monge-Ampère equation in dimension two. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **19**(3), 780–810 (2013)

[16] Caffarelli, L., Nirenberg, L., Spruck, J.: The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations. I. Monge-Ampère equation. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **37**(3), 369–402 (1984)

[17] Davydov, O., Saeed, A.: Numerical solution of fully nonlinear elliptic equations by Böhmer's method. J. Comput. Appl. Math. **254**, 43–54 (2013)

[18] Dean, E.J., Glowinski, R.: Numerical solution of the two-dimensional elliptic Monge-Ampère equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions: an augmented Lagrangian approach. C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **336**(9), 779–784 (2003)

[19] Dinew, S., Zhang, X., Zhang, X.: The $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimate of complex Monge-Ampère equation. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **60**(5), 1713–1722 (2011)

[20] Feng, X., Neilan, M.: Error analysis for mixed finite element approximations of the fully nonlinear Monge-Ampère equation based on the vanishing moment method. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **47**(2), 1226–1250 (2009)

[21] Froese, B.D., Oberman, A.M.: Convergent filtered schemes for the Monge-Ampère partial differential equation. SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **51**(1), 423–444 (2013)

[22] Gilbarg, D., Trudinger, N.S.: Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2001). Reprint of the 1998 edition

[23] Glowinski, R.: Numerical methods for fully nonlinear elliptic equations. In: ICIAM 07—6th International Congress on Industrial and Applied Mathematics, pp. 155–192. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich (2009)

[24] Gutiérrez, C.E.: The Monge-Ampère equation. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 44. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA (2001)

[25] Hartenstine, D.: The Dirichlet problem for the Monge-Ampère equation in convex (but not strictly convex) domains. Electron. J. Differential Equations pp. No. 138, 9 pp. (electronic) (2006)

[26] Lakkis, O., Pryer, T.: A finite element method for nonlinear elliptic problems. SIAM J. Sci. Comput. **35**(4), A2025–A2045 (2013)

[27] Neilan, M.: Finite element methods for fully nonlinear second order PDEs based on a discrete Hessian with applications to the Monge–Ampère equation. J. Comput. Appl. Math. **263**, 351–369 (2014)

[28] Oliker, V.I., Prussner, L.D.: On the numerical solution of the equation $(\partial^2 z/\partial x^2)(\partial^2 z/\partial y^2) - ((\partial^2 z/\partial x \partial y))^2 = f$ and its discretizations. I. Numer. Math. **54**(3), 271–293 (1988)

[29] Rauch, J., Taylor, B.A.: The Dirichlet problem for the multidimensional Monge-Ampère equation. Rocky Mountain J. Math. **7**(2), 345–364 (1977)

[30] Rockafellar, R.T.: Convex analysis. Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 28. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. (1970)
[31] Royden, H.L.: Real analysis, third edn. Macmillan Publishing Company, New York (1988)
[32] Trudinger, N.S., Wang, X.J.: Boundary regularity for the Monge-Ampère and affine maximal surface equations. Ann. of Math. (2) **167**(3), 993–1028 (2008)

Department of Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science, M/C 249. University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL 60607-7045, USA

E-mail address: awanou@uic.edu

URL: http://www.math.uic.edu/~awanou